



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CV

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,297	03/31/2004	Timothy James Jegla	018512-005920US	8561

20350 7590 03/02/2006

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

CHERNYSHEV, OLGA N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1649

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/815,297

Applicant(s)

JEGLA, TIMOTHY JAMES

Examiner

Olga N. Chernyshev

Art Unit

1649

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/31/4.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 1649

DETAILED ACTION

Formal matters

1. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 1649.
2. Claims 12-18 are pending in the instant application. Claims 12-18 are under examination in the instant office action.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed on March 31, 2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(b)(5), which require the following:

(b)(5) Each publication listed in an information disclosure statement must be identified by publisher, author (if any), title, relevant pages of the publication, date, and place of publication.

The information disclosure statement filed on March 31, 2004 has been considered in part; specifically references AE-AG and AL have not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is drawn to an invention with no apparent or disclosed specific and substantial credible utility. The instant

Art Unit: 1649

application has provided a description of an isolated DNA encoding a protein and the protein encoded thereby. The instant application does not disclose a specific biological role for this protein or its significance to a particular disease, disorder or physiological process, which one would wish to manipulate for a desired clinical effect.

It is clear from the instant application that the protein described therein is what is termed an “orphan protein” in the art. The DNA of the instant application has been isolated because of its similarity to a known DNA. There is little doubt that, after complete characterization, this DNA and encoded protein may be found to have a specific and substantial credible utility. This further characterization, however, is part of the act of invention and until it has been undertaken, Applicant’s claimed invention is incomplete. The instant situation is directly analogous to that which was addressed in *Brenner v. Manson*, 148 U.S.P.Q. 689 (Sus. Ct, 1966), in which a novel compound which was structurally analogous to other compounds which were known to possess anti-cancer activity was alleged to be potentially useful as an anti-tumor agent in the absence of evidence supporting this utility. The court expressed the opinion that all chemical compounds are “useful” as it appears in 35 U.S.C. § 101, which requires that an invention must have either an immediate obvious or fully disclosed “real world” utility. The court held that:

“The basic quid pro quo contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the public from an invention with substantial utility”, “[u]nless and until a process is refined and developed to this point-where specific benefit exists in currently available form-there is insufficient justification for permitting an applicant to engross what may prove to be a broad field”, and “a patent is not a hunting license”, “[i]t is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion”.

Art Unit: 1649

The instant claims are drawn to an isolated polypeptide of as yet undetermined function or biological significance. The instant specification identifies the claimed novel polypeptide as “Kv10.1 voltage-gated potassium channel of the Kv (or KCNA) gene family” (top at page 3 of the instant specification). It is also disclosed that “Kv10.1 is expressed in the brain (e.g., whole brain, substantia nigra, and frontal cortex), spinal cord, prostate and retina”. Because of the structural similarity of the instant novel claimed polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 3 to other members of Kv superfamily (see Figures 1 and 2), it was concluded that the instant Kv10.1 would also possess similar biological activity and, therefore, represents a novel potassium channel. Numerous publications exist on a topic of predicting protein functions from structural similarities or homology to the known proteins. It is well described in the art that amino acid structure cannot necessarily predict the function of the protein: “Knowing the protein structure by itself is insufficient to annotate a number of functional classes and is also insufficient for annotating the specific details of protein function” (see Skolnick et al., Box 2 on page 36 and the whole paper). Moreover, “Structural similarity does not necessarily mean a common evolutionary origin and homologous sequences may evolve into different folds (according to current classification schemes) (See Bork et al., Current Opinion in structural Biology, 1998, 8, page 332, first column, second paragraph). Thus, according to the state of the art, functional characteristics of a protein cannot be unequivocally extrapolated from its structural characteristics.

In the absence of knowledge of the biological significance of this specific polypeptide Kv10.1 of SEQ ID NO: 3, there appears to be no immediately obvious patentable use for it. It is asserted in the instant disclosure that “[m]odulators of Kv10.1 are useful in treating CNS disorders, such as epilepsy and other seizure disorders, Parkinson’s disease, migraines, psychotic

Art Unit: 1649

disorders such as schizophrenia and depression, cognitive disorders such as learning and memory disorders, neuropathic pain, vision disorders, prostate hyperplasia, for controlling spermatocyte maturation and motility, for treating infertility, and as contraceptive agents. Modulators are also useful as neuroprotective agents (e.g., to prevent stroke)” (page 3). The instant specification fails to provide any evidence or sound scientific reasoning that would support a conclusion that the instant polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 3 is associated with any disease or disorder. To employ the instant claimed polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 3 in the future “methods of screening for activators and inhibitors of potassium channels that contain Kv10.1 subunit” (bottom at page 8) is not a “real world” because it would eventually relate to a protein for which no biological function is known. The instant application also fails to demonstrate use of the protein as a marker for any disease or condition (which would be a real world use). Because the instant specification does not teach a biological activity of the protein, which supports a practical utility, one would not reasonably believe that the administration of the modulators of the claimed polypeptide would prevent or treat a condition or disease, including CNS disorders, vision problems and psychotic disorders, as implied by the specification. To employ a polypeptide of the instant invention in any of the disclosed methods would clearly be using it as the object of further research, which has been determined by the courts to be a utility, which, alone, does not support patentability. Since the instant specification does not disclose a credible “real world” use for the Kv10.1 polypeptide in their currently available form, then the claimed invention is incomplete and, therefore, does not meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being useful.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 12-18 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a clear asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

8. Claims 12-15 and 17-18 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 12 is directed to polypeptides having at least 60% amino acid sequence identity with a particular disclosed sequence. Claims 13-15 and 17-18 are dependent claims. The claims do not require that the polypeptides to possess any particular conserved structure or other disclosed distinguishing feature. Thus, the claims are drawn to a genus of polypeptides that is defined only by sequence identity. However, the instant specification fails to describe the entire genus of proteins, which are encompassed by these claims. In making a determination of whether the application complies with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, it is necessary to understand what Applicant has possession of and what Applicant is claiming. From the specification, it is clear that Applicant has possession of a nucleic acid molecule which encodes a protein which has the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 3. This

Art Unit: 1649

nucleic acid molecule has a nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2. The claims are drawn to proteins having at least 60% sequence identity with a particular disclosed sequence. Thus, the claims are not limited to a protein with a specific amino acid sequence. The claims only require the claimed polypeptides to share some degree of structural similarity to the isolated protein of SEQ ID NO: 3. The specification only describes a protein having the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 3 and fails to teach or describe any other protein which lacks the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 3 and has the activities possessed by the isolated protein (being able to form a Kv potassium channel).

To provide adequate written description and evidence of possession of a claimed genus, the specification must provide sufficient distinguishing identifying characteristics of the genus. The factors to be considered include disclosure of complete or partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics, structure/function correlation, methods of making the claimed product, or any combination thereof. In this case, the only factor present in the claim is a partial structure in the form of a recitation of percent identity. There is not even identification of any particular portion of the structure that must be conserved. As stated above, it is not even clear what region of the encoded polypeptide has the disclosed activity. The specification does not provide a complete structure of those polypeptides having at least 60% sequence identity with a polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 3 and fails to provide a representative number of species for the claimed genus (those proteins having at least 60% sequence identity with a polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 1). Accordingly, in the absence of sufficient recitation of distinguishing identifying characteristics, the specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed genus.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*.” (See page 1117.) The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). As discussed above, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of polypeptides, and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481 at 1483. In *Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF’s were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Therefore, only isolated polypeptides comprising the amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO: 3, but not the full breadth of the claim meets the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

Art Unit: 1649

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

11. Claims 12 and 15 are vague and indefinite in so far as it employs the term “Kv10.1” as a limitation. This term is appears to be novel, and without a reference to a precise amino acid sequence identified by a proper SEQ ID NO: one cannot determine the metes and bounds of “Kv10.1”. Moreover, because the instant specification does not identify that property or combination of properties which is unique to and, therefore, definitive of a “Kv10.1”, an artisan cannot determine if a compound which meets all of the other limitations of a claim would then be included or excluded from the claimed subject matter by the presence of this limitation.

12. Claim 12 is further vague and ambiguous for recitation “subsequence”. The term “subsequence” is not positively defined in the instant specification; therefore, the relationship between sequence and subsequence is not clear and cannot be determined from the claim or the instant specification.

13. Claim 18 recites the limitation "the nucleic acid" in claim 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

14. Claims 13, 14, 16 and 17 are indefinite for being dependent from indefinite claims.

Double Patenting

Art Unit: 1649

15. Applicant is advised that should claim 12 be found allowable, claims 13 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

In the instant case, there appears to be no further limitations added to claim 13, which would distinguish the claimed polypeptides.

Conclusion

16. No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olga N. Chernyshev whose telephone number is (571) 272-0870. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet L. Andres can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1649

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Olga N. Chernyshev, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1649

February 24, 2006